IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.R.UDAYABHANU

FRIDAY, THE 1ST JUNE 2007 / 11TH JYAISHTA 1929

RPFC.No. 223 of 2007()

MC.253/2000 of FAMILY COURT, MALAPPURAM
.....

PETITIONER

E.A.RASHEED, S/O.E.KUNHIMOIDEENKUTTY,
ENNISSERY VEEDU, PANANGATTOOR P.O.,
TANUR.

BY ADV. SRI.A.N.KUTTAN
SRI.C.CHANDRASEKHARAN

RESPONDENTS:
---

1. KOORIKKATTIL MYMOONA, D/O.KADER,
ERANELLOOR P.O., OZHOOR.

2. MUHAMMED NADEER, AGED 7 YEARS (MINOR)
REPRESENTED BY NO. 1 OF DO. DO.

3. MUHAMMED NIZAM, AGED 5 YEARS,
(MINOR) REPRESENTED BY NO. 1 OF DO. DO.

BY ADV. SRI. AMJAD ALI, PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

THIS REV.PETITION(FAMILY COURT) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 01/06/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

K.R. UDAYABHANU, J

==========

R.P.(F.C) NO. 223 OF 2007

==========

Dated this the 1st day of June 2007

O R D E R

The revision petitioner/respondent in M.C. No. 253/2000 has challenged the order of the court below granting maintenance to the wife at the rate of Rs.250 and to the children at Rs. 350 each.

The contention of the revision petitioner is that the wife refused to live with him and that she has got other income and that she is working as a tailor and further that in the first round of litigation the court below had only provided maintenance to both the children a sum of Rs.350 altogether and not separately. I find that both the contentions appear to be far from true. It is seen from the order of the court below that the revision petitioner has married again during the pendency of the earlier litigation. Hence, there is no meaning in contending that the petitioner in the MC should have lived with him. It is clear from the order of the court below that the maintenance to the children

were ordered at the rate of Rs. 350 each and not Rs.350 for both the children together. I find no ground to admit the revision petition and the same is dismissed in limine.

K.R. UDAYABHANU, JUDGE.

rv